

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

May 15, 2002

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Vlad Voytilla called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Chairman Vlad Voytilla, Planning Commissioners Bob Barnard, Gary Bliss, Eric Johansen and Shannon Pogue; and Alternate Planning Commissioner Steven Olson. Planning Commissioners Dan Maks and Bill Young were excused.

Senior Planner John Osterberg, Senior Planner Barbara Fryer, Associate Planner Veronica Smith, Principal Planner Hal Bergsma and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Voytilla, who presented the format for the meeting.

VISITORS:

Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item. There were none.

NEW BUSINESS:

Chairman Voytilla opened the Public Hearing and read the format for Public Hearings. There were no disqualifications of the Planning Commission members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Commissioner to hear any of the agenda items, to participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda. There was no response.

For the benefit of any members of the audience who intend to testify with regard to SV 2002-0001 – SW Metz Street and SW 124th Avenue Street Vacation, Senior Planner John Osterberg pointed out that the applicant has requested a continuance until May 22, 2002.

1 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

2

3 **A. SNC 2002-0001 – HENRY STREET AND BEAVERDAM ROAD**

4 The City of Beaverton has filed a request for a Street Name Change to
5 establish a consistent street name along the newly constructed Henry Street
6 route, and the proposed street name change will eliminate the confusion of
7 multiple street names along this route. Portions of Henry Street and
8 Beaverdam Road will renamed to Millikan Way. The proposed street name
9 would be Millikan Way, which will extend from 160th Avenue on the west
10 to its east terminus near Lombard Avenue.

11

12 This street name change would effect the following specific areas:

13

14 ?? all of the southeasterly extension of Millikan Way from the east
15 line of SW Hocken Avenue to its intersection with the North line of
16 Henry Street;

17

18 ?? all of SW Henry Street east of SW Lloyd Street to the west line of
19 Cedar Hills Boulevard;

20

21 ?? all of a proposed street being the easterly extension of SW Henry
22 Street to the West line of Rose Biggi Avenue, an unnamed street
23 running from Rose Biggi Avenue to the east, turning southeasterly
24 along the Burlington Northern Rail Road right-of-way to the
25 northwest line of Beaverdam Road; and

26

27 ?? all of SW Beaverdam Road from the southwest line of the railroad
28 right-of-way easterly to the west line of the William Lockerman
29 DLC No. 45.

30

31 Following a review and recommendation from the Planning Commission,
32 the City Council will consider the recommendation on the Consent
33 Agenda at their meeting on June 17, 2002. If the City Council elects to
34 hold a public hearing on the matter, additional public notice will be
35 provided at that time. The proposed Street Name Change will affect the
36 roads described above and are located on Washington County Assessor's
37 Map 1S1-16 and 1S1-15. The affected parcels are zoned General
38 Commercial (GC) and Regional Center-Transit Oriented (RC-TO).

39

40 Mr. Osterberg presented the Staff Report and briefly explained this City-initiated
41 proposal, including the potential impact on any adjoining properties. He observed
42 that staff has not been contacted by the owners of any of this adjoining property,
43 adding that the application meets all applicable criteria for approval. Concluding,
44 he recommended approval of the proposal, which would involve a
45 recommendation to the City Council, who will review and make a final decision
46 with regard to the recommendation at a future meeting, and offered to respond to
47 any questions.

1 Chairman Voytilla requested clarification of whether there has been any public
2 response generated by the Neighborhood Meeting for this proposal.

3
4 Mr. Osterberg advised Chairman Voytilla that no Neighborhood Meeting is
5 required for an application for a Street Name Change, noting that although
6 appropriate notification was provided, including posting of the subject property,
7 staff has received no communications from the public with regard to this
8 application.

9
10 Commissioner Bliss requested clarification of the driving force behind this
11 proposal to change the names of these streets.

12
13 Mr. Osterberg explained that the primary goal is to have a single street name in
14 anticipation of the Millikan Way Extension, adding that the construction has
15 already been initiated for this project between SW Hocken Street and SW Cedar
16 Hills Boulevard. Observing that it has been approved by the City Council, he
17 pointed out that the next phase of this project would begin between SW Cedar
18 Hills Boulevard and SW Rose Biggi Avenue would be started soon.

19
20 Commissioner Bliss mentioned that although he understands Mr. Osterberg's
21 comments, the City of Beaverton has never felt that a single street name was
22 necessary for these particular streets in the past. Observing that SW Allen
23 Boulevard, SW Davies Street and SW Oak Street are all one street; that SW Hart
24 Road and SW Bangy Road are the same street; and that SW Greenway Avenue,
25 SW Brockman Road, SW Beard Road, SW Nora Road are the same road; he
26 noted that some of these streets have been improved over the past five to ten years
27 without creating a single street name.

28
29 Mr. Osterberg expressed his opinion that Mr. Bliss had provided examples of
30 what he does not consider comprehensive street name planning, adding that staff
31 would prefer that this type of planning be discontinued.

32
33 Chairman Voytilla referred to Commissioner Bliss' comments with regard to the
34 various street names, observing that the City of Beaverton is currently involved in
35 the reconstruction of the connection of SW Davies Street and that the extension of
36 SW Allen Boulevard had been completed several years in the past. Noting that
37 the construction of the connection of SW Hart Road to SW Bany Road is
38 scheduled to begin in the near future, he requested clarification of whether staff
39 would be proposing street name changes with regard to these streets as well.

40
41 Mr. Osterberg advised Chairman Voytilla that the applicant is probably in a better
42 position to address this issue.

43
44 Referring to Development Code Section 9.02.050 – Selection of Street Names,
45 which indicates that streets shall be named in accordance with the Street Name
46 Plan, Commissioner Bliss mentioned Program 1, which addresses Neighborhood

1 Identity. He expressed his opinion that because both SW Henry Street and SW
2 Beaverdam Road have been established historically, it would be feasible to
3 terminate SW Millikan Way at SW Watson Street and retain SW Beaverdam
4 Road, which is, in essence, a historic name that had been platted in 1881. He
5 pointed out that he has a conflict with that particular section, adding that he is
6 doubtful that the applicable criterion has been adequately addressed.
7

8 Citing the provision within the Community Street Name Plan, which suggests the
9 adoption of a single street name even when a street passes through multiple street
10 name districts, Mr. Osterberg referred to Policy No. 5 on page 2 of the Street
11 Name Plan. He explained that essentially, there should be a single street name
12 without altering these street names due to the individual district themes.
13

14 Commissioner Bliss informed Mr. Osterberg that he understands this concept,
15 pointing out that this section provides that “streets shall be determined by the
16 district of origin”, expressing his opinion that the district of origin involves what
17 had been platted in 1881, specifically SW Beaverdam Road. He reiterated that
18 the criterion with regard to Section 9.02.050 has not been appropriately addressed.
19

20 Mr. Osterberg responded that staff has determined that the district of origin is the
21 district in which SW Millikan Way is currently located.
22

23 Commissioner Bliss stated that he has referenced the Street Name District, which
24 is part of the Street Name Plan that establishes these districts.
25

26 Mr. Osterberg clarified that SW Millikan Way originates in the Street Name
27 District referred to as the Science/Technology District.
28

29 Commissioner Pogue requested clarification of how the Post Office receives this
30 type of notification.
31

32 Mr. Osterberg explained that the Beaverton Postmaster received this notification
33 through the mail, in addition to the notifications that are posted on the bulletin
34 board within the Post Office.
35

36 **APPLICANT:**

37

38 **RANDY WOOLEY**, representing the applicant, who is the City of Beaverton
39 Engineering Department, explained that the applicant had met with the
40 appropriate Central Beaverton NAC in the course of this application. He
41 indicated the location of the existing streets on an illustration, and provided a brief
42 history of the streets and area, including a former railroad right-of-way that has
43 never been officially named. He observed that numerous projects are currently
44 underway, including the SW Millikan Way Extension, from SW Hocken Street to
45 SW Cedar Hills Boulevard, and a portion of SW Henry Street off of SW Rose
46 Biggi Avenue that has also never been officially named. He discussed the

1 recently approved SW Henry Street Extension, which is located near *Beaverton*
2 *Foods*, connecting SW Cedar Hills Boulevard to SW Rose Biggi Avenue.
3 Referring to The Round Project, he noted that this street has been called SW
4 Henry Street, adding that the existing fences will be removed and the street
5 dedicated and opened in the near future. He discussed what would be achieved
6 with the proposed street connections, observing that the result would be one
7 continuous street that corresponds with the Comprehensive Plan Transportation
8 Map for this area, which referred to as a downtown area connectivity street.
9 Referring to the proposed street alignment that would occur in the next few
10 months, he pointed out that in an effort to avoid confusion and provide
11 consistency, staff had determined that prior to the addition of new buildings and
12 new addresses, this street should have one continuous name.

13
14 Noting that this action actually reflects an established precedent, Mr. Wooley
15 mentioned that Mayor Drake had advised him that although the City Council had
16 previously approved one continuous name for SW Greenway/SW Brockman/SW
17 Nora, the Mayor at that time had vetoed this action for a reason. He explained
18 that this situation involves several differences, adding that the majority of this
19 street is still new and has only three established addresses and that some of the
20 portions of these streets would retain their existing names, which would create an
21 element of confusion that is not present at the other locations. Mentioning the
22 meeting with the Central Beaverton NAC that had taken place last fall, he pointed
23 out that the NAC had basically approved of what he referred to as a “no brainer”.
24 He emphasized that although notification had been provided to the public, no
25 member of the public had attended the NAC Meeting, and although the owners of
26 affected addresses had received notification, none of them had testified with
27 regard to this proposal. Concluding, he explained that because SW Henry Street
28 and SW Beaverton Road continue to exist on other alignments, staff had
29 determined that SW Millikan Way would be an appropriate name.

30
31 Commissioner Johansen pointed out that there would be a need to quantify the
32 other sections that are not included in the extension and street name change,
33 expressing his opinion that the problem has not been totally resolved.

34
35 Mr. Wooley agreed that the sections that are not included in this proposal could
36 be a source of confusion.

37
38 Commissioner Johansen requested clarification of whether SW Millikan Way
39 would be continuous through the area of The Round.

40
41 Mr. Wooley clarified that the only portion of this street that would change within
42 the area of The Round is SW Henry Street.

43
44 Referring to the intersection of the existing SW Beaverdam Road on the south-
45 west and the proposed new SW Millikan Way, Commissioner Bliss requested
46 clarification of what type of intersection would be provided at this location.

1 Mr. Wooley advised Commissioner Bliss that staff does not anticipate that this
2 connection would ever be made.

3
4 Chairman Voytilla referred to the SW Henry Street/SW Lloyd Avenue
5 connection, questioning how this would eventually be achieved.

6
7 Mr. Wooley advised Chairman Voytilla that SW Lloyd Avenue would eventually
8 connect into the new SW Millikan Way Extension, with a right turn-out only,
9 adding that the curbs have already been poured within the construction zone. He
10 pointed out that SW Henry Street would be two-way street that would "T" into
11 SW Lloyd Avenue, adding that the very short section of SW Lloyd Avenue
12 between SW Henry Street and the new SW Millikan Way Extension would be a
13 northbound one-way connecting to eastbound SW Millikan Way.

14
15 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

16
17 On question, no member of the public testified with regard to this proposal.

18
19 On question, staff had no further comments with regard to this application.

20
21 The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

22
23 Commissioner Bliss reiterated that while he is not totally satisfied that all
24 applicable criteria with regard Development Code Section 9.02.050 as it relates to
25 this particular application has been met, a precedence has been established and
26 that the proposal involves what appears to be a logical point of stopping SW
27 Millikan Way and retaining SW Beaverdam Road. Observing that he is in favor
28 of continuous street names, he pointed out that the remaining criteria are met,
29 adding that he is in support of a motion for approval.

30
31 Emphasizing that he lives on one of the roads with four names, Commissioner
32 Barnard pointed out that it is difficult to provide adequate directions to his home,
33 adding that he fully supports a motion for approval.

34
35 Commissioner Johansen expressed his agreement with his fellow Commissioners,
36 observing that relatively few properties are involved, adding that the proposal
37 meets applicable criteria and he would support a motion for approval.

38
39 Pointing out that he is also in favor of continuous street names, Chairman Voytilla
40 stated that the application meets applicable criteria and that he is in support of a
41 motion for approval.

42
43 Commissioner Pogue stated that based upon the facts and findings within the Staff
44 Support, he would support a motion for approval of the application.

45

Commissioner Pogue **MOVED** and Commissioner Barnard **SECONDED** a motion to approve SNC 2002-0001 – Henry Street and Beaverdam Road Street Name Change, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits, new evidence presented during the Public Hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated May 8, 2002, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 and 2.

Motion **CARRIED**, by the following vote:

AYES: Barnard, Bliss, Johansen, Pogue and Voytilla.

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ABSENT: Maks and Young

B. SV 2002-0001 – SW METZ STREET AND SW 124TH AVENUE STREET VACATION

(Request for continuance to May 22, 2002)

The City of Beaverton is the owner of land, known as Tax Lot 601 that was intended for future street improvements to SW Metz and for extension of SW 124th Ave. south of Metz. The City does not need lot 601 for the purpose of streets, and now submits a petition, that includes the consent of property owners in the affected area, of the request for street vacation to dispose of a portion of this property. There is no proposal to vacate or close the 15-foot wide eastern portion of Lot 601, which is currently used for a pedestrian pathway between SW Sussex and Metz St. In addition, there is no proposal to close or change the existing streets of SW Metz and SW 124th Avenue.

The portion of the Metz street vacation is approximately 220 feet in length by 6 feet in width, along the south side of Metz Street east of Hall Blvd. The land comprising the 124th Ave. vacation extends south of the existing terminus of 124th Ave. at Metz, and is approximately 55 feet in length by approximately 35 feet in width. The vacated area of lot 601 would not abut Tax Lot 500. The area of excess property not needed for future improvements to Metz St. and 124th Ave., which is the subject of this vacation request, is approximately 3,100 square feet. The proposed Street Vacation is located south of Metz Street, west of SW 124th Ave.; Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-22BC on Tax Lot 601. The property is zoned Urban High Density (R-1) and overall is approximately 0.15 acres in size. Further information may be obtained by contacting the Development Services Division at 503-526-2348.

Commissioner Johansen **MOVED** and Commissioner Barnard **SECONDED** a motion that SV 2002-0001 – SW Metz Street and SW 124th Avenue Street Vacation be continued to a date certain of May 22, 2002.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

1 7:35 p.m. – Mr. Osterberg left.
2

3 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**
4

5 Minutes of the meeting (Planning Commission/Board of Design Review
6 Workshop Session – Proposed Telecommunications Ordinance) of March 13,
7 2002, submitted. Commissioner Barnard **MOVED** and Commissioner Bliss
8 **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be approved as written.
9

10 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.
11

12 Minutes of the meeting of March 27, 2002, submitted. Commissioner Johansen
13 observed that public comment has been received with regard to page 20,
14 requesting that lines 12 and 13 reflect that this communication bore signatures
15 representing 57 condominium units rather than 57 signatures. Commissioner
16 Barnard pointed out that line 35 of page 20 indicates that 56 condominium units
17 are represented. Commissioner Johansen and Chairman Voytilla expressed their
18 opinion that lines 12 and 13 should remain as originally written. Commissioner
19 Johansen requested that lines 19 through 21 of page 22 be amended, as follows:
20 “Observing that she **does not** represents ~~the~~ anyone but is a homeowner in the
21 area of Hyland Hills ~~Townhouse Association~~, **she mentioned that she had**
22 **prepared a letter which many of her neighbors signed,** many of whom are in
23 attendance, and she read **her** ~~their~~ prepared statement requesting denial of the
24 application.” Commissioner Johansen **MOVED** and Commissioner Barnard
25 **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be approved as amended.
26

27 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.
28

29 Minutes of the meeting of April 3, 2002, submitted. Commissioner Johansen
30 **MOVED** and Commissioner Barnard **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be
31 approved as written.
32

33 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.
34

35 The meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m.
36

37 **OLD BUSINESS:**
38

39 **CONTINUANCES:**
40

41 **WORK SESSION:**
42

43 **A. SCENIC TREE PROJECT**

44 (Continued from May 1, 2002)

45 Discussion regarding the Scenic Tree Inventory data.
46

1 Senior Planner Barbara Fryer mentioned that she had provided incorrect data at
2 the Work Session on May 1, 2002, and clarified that there are only 140 Groves,
3 221 Neighborhood Groves, 45 Corridors, 506 Individual Trees, for a total of 912
4 resources. She pointed out that in order to determine significance, it is possible to
5 require that a resource score three on a certain number of characteristics, adding
6 that it is also acceptable to consider a mode, average or median or numerous other
7 ways to consider significance. Observing that she had requested the
8 Commissioners' top three preferences at the Workshop Session, she noted that
9 these had been reduced down into a graphic (Exhibit 1). She mentioned that
10 basically, appearance, health (inventory), health (stock), health (grove) and age
11 for Neighborhood Grove resources would be rated with a weighting scale, as
12 follows:

13
14 ?? Health 4
15 ?? Appearance 3
16 ?? Age 2
17

18 Ms. Fryer discussed and displayed photographs of different Neighborhood
19 Groves, as follows:
20

21 ?? Located between SW Olson Road and Highway 217, north of SW Hall
22 Boulevard. Observing that this is located within the boundary of the
23 Washington Square Regional Center, she emphasized that this would not
24 affect the zoning designation. She mentioned that this grove of trees
25 provides a very interesting mixture of different species, both native and
26 non-native, including Sequoia, Douglas Fir, Blue Douglas Fir, Ponderosa
27 Pine, Sweet Gum, Maple, Pen Oak, True Cedar, Oregon White Oak,
28 Cottonwood, Spruce, Blue Spruce and Port Orford Cedar. She pointed out
29 that only any type of rules or regulations would govern the species listed
30 in the inventory for the Neighborhood Groves.

31 ?? Located on the north side of Murray Ridge, and the south side of SW
32 Pintail Loop and SW Cardinal Loop. She mentioned that this tree grove
33 includes Douglas Fir and Big Leaf Maple, adding that although some of
34 the trees on Murray Ridge had been removed during the construction of
35 the new development, the grove is still intact.

36 ?? Located at the corner of SW Weir Road and SW 158th Avenue, adding that
37 this tree grove includes some stand-alone Douglas Fir that had remained
38 following development of the area.

39 ?? Located within a developed condominium complex, including greater than
40 50 Oregon White Oak.

41 ?? Douglas Fir located east of SW Davies Road on SW Citation Street and
42 north of SW Scholls Ferry Road within a set aside tract.

43 ?? Located north of SW Canyon Road on SW Laurelwood Street and SW
44 Fairway Street, observing that these are remnant trees on an old golf
45 course, including Western Red Cedar, Douglas Fir and True Cedars.

1 ?? Located within the Cornell Oaks Business Park, noting that these trees are
2 located on undeveloped properties at NW 158th Avenue.

3 ?? Located within the Cornell Oaks Business Park, adding that this group
4 involves approximately nine remnant Oak Trees off of NW Greenbrier
5 Street.

6 ?? Douglas Fir behind an apartment and along the edge of Summer Creek,
7 south of Scholls Ferry Road.
8

9 Ms. Fryer discussed the rating of different Individual Trees, observing that the
10 results of the weighting scale is as follows:
11

12 ?? Health 4

13 ?? Appearance 3

14 ?? Age 2
15

16 Commissioner Johansen requested clarification of who was involved in scoring
17 the trees.
18

19 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Johansen that both herself and Associate
20 Planner Veronica Smith had worked out in the field, typically assisted by another
21 individual.
22

23 Commissioner Johansen pointed out that two different individuals could
24 conceivably utilize a different scoring system, observing that it is difficult to be
25 objective in what is basically a subjective evaluation.
26

27 Ms. Fryer explained that she and Ms. Smith worked together as a team to provide
28 consistency to the rating system before splitting into two teams.
29

30 Ms. Fryer discussed and displayed photographs of different Individual Trees, as
31 follows:
32

33 ?? Oregon White Oak, at a school in the northern portion of the City.

34 ?? Oregon White Oak, off of Butner Street.

35 ?? Oak, next to the Portland Clinic on SW 160th Avenue and SW Millikan
36 Way.

37 ?? Douglas Fir on SW 28th Avenue.

38 ?? Oregon White Oak.

39 ?? Western Red Cedar, with three trunks, each of which is approximately
40 three feet in diameter, in the Garden Home area.

41 ?? Ponderosa Pine on SW 2nd Street, in the downtown area.

42 ?? Blue Spruce in an individual yard.

43 ?? Oregon White Oak on SW Hall Boulevard (being inundated by ivy).

44 ?? Oregon White Oak on SW Denney Road, trimmed to allow for the power
45 lines.

- 1 ?? Two Non-Native Trees, a Silver Maple in Garden Home, and an Oak, east
2 of Laurelwood.
3 ?? Deadore Cedar, east of SW Murray Boulevard and north of SW 6th Street.
4 ?? Maple, within the condominium development on SW 6th Street.
5 ?? Oak, north of SW Canyon Road.
6 ?? Oregon White Oak, in downtown Beaverton, near *Saturn of Beaverton*.
7 ?? 2 Incense Cedars on Conestoga Street.
8 ?? 2 Oak, on the corner of SW 5th Street and SW Western Avenue, within an
9 industrial development.
10 ?? Non-Native Oak, north of SW Canyon Road.
11 ?? A very interesting Ponderosa Pine – the tallest tree in the area, on SW
12 Alexander Street, east of SW 185th Avenue.

13
14 Ms. Fryer discus sed the rating of different Corridors, observing that the results of
15 the weighting scale is as follows:

- 16
17 ?? Appearance 4
18 ?? Context 2
19 ?? Age 2
20 ?? Frame 2

21
22 Ms. Fryer discussed and displayed photographs of different Corridors, as follows:

- 23
24 ?? Douglas Firs, on SW 155th Avenue, north of SW Hart Road.
25 ?? Sweet Gum, Pine, Ash and Big Leaf Maple on SW Greenway Boulevard.
26 ?? Ash and Maple in the planter strips at Beaverton High School.

27
28 Chairman Voytilla advised Ms. Fryer that action has already been taken with
29 regard to improvements at Beaverton High School that would eliminate the trees
30 in the planter strips.

- 31
32 ?? Birch on SW Center Street, at the Performance High School.
33 ?? A beautiful row of Pine on one side and Oak on the other side at the
34 entrance to the Sisters of St. Mary's, entering from SW Farmington Road.
35 ?? Sequoia, Douglas Fir, Sweet Gum and Blue Spruce at the church on
36 Walker Road, east of Murray Boulevard.
37 ?? Maple within a development on SW Artic Drive.
38 ?? Columnar Maples on Bob White Terrace.
39 ?? A row of Ash, with Beech and flowering Cherry at the *Target Store* on
40 Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway.
41 ?? Sweet Gum along SW 110th Avenue.

42
43 Ms. Fryer discussed the rating of different Groves, observing that the results of
44 the weighting scale is as follows:
45

1 ?? Appearance 3
2 ?? Health 4
3 ?? Age 2

4

5 Ms. Fryer discussed and displayed photographs of different Groves, as follows:

6 ?? Just east of the THPRD Terpening Center.
7 ?? Murray Hill, part of the Summer Creek System.
8 ?? Off of Murray Boulevard, north of Walker Road.
9 ?? South of the Sunset Highway and west of Cedar Hills Boulevard.
10 ?? North of SW Beard Road and east of the power lines.
11 ?? THPRD Terpening Center.
12 ?? Remnant Grove at the corner of 158th Avenue and Walker Road.
13 ?? Remnant Grove of Oregon Oak on Jenkins Road.
14 ?? Remnant Grove at Kingsport Apartments on Shandell.
15 ?? Jenkins and 153rd Avenue, between Reser's and 153rd Avenue, within a
16 wetland area.
17 ?? Ash complex on Willow Creek just south of Cornell Road and north of
18 Waterhouse.
19 ?? Autumn Ridge Park, set aside as a separate tract from development.
20 ?? Small grove of trees off of 162nd Avenue, with new development.
21 ?? North of Canyon Road and south of Highway 26.
22 ?? West of 170th Avenue and north of Pheasant Lane.
23 ?? North of Farmington near 160th.
24 ?? Off of 160th Avenue (potential as Neighborhood Grove).

25

26 Ms. Fryer observed that the next step involves considering significance,
27 recommending that the Commission either choose a percentage to meet for
28 significance or that a resource must be at least average, especially with regard to
29 Corridors, Neighborhood Groves and Individual Trees. Observing that there are
30 so few Groves, including a mix of both developed and undeveloped areas, she
31 pointed out that it might be appropriate to consider a greater number of the groves
32 with regard to determining significance. She recommended that any of the
33 Groves that are not considered significant at this point be reevaluated for a
34 Neighborhood Grove status. She mentioned that the Comprehensive Plan does
35 establish an opportunity for a determination of significance, observing that
36 Chapter 7 provides that significant scenic sites may include forested or a
37 specimen tree with two or more of these characteristics, as follows:

38

39 ?? Aesthetic value.
40 ?? Uniqueness of size or shape.
41 ?? Rarity of species.
42 ?? Proximity of forested areas to wetlands or riparian areas.
43 ?? Provide slope stability.
44 ?? Absorb rainfall and storm water.

1 ?? All significant scenic sites must be visible from an existing or planned
2 viewpoint that is accessible to the public.

3
4 Observing that staff requires 30 days to mail out notification for a Comprehensive
5 Plan Amendment, Ms. Fryer pointed out that this Public Hearing would most
6 likely be scheduled in July.

7 Commissioner Pogue mentioned that the modified count includes 912 resources,
8 requesting clarification of how these resources had been selected.

9
10 Ms. Fryer explained that basically several members of staff had taken individual
11 section maps with aerial photo overlaid of the original inventory prepared by
12 *Shapiro & Associates* in 1999 and gone out to these areas, collected additional
13 data and prepared an updated document.

14
15 Commissioner Pogue expressed his appreciation of staff's efforts with regard to
16 the preparation of this tree inventory.

17
18 Ms. Fryer expressed her opinion that staff had possibly over-inventoried these
19 resources.

20
21 Commissioner Barnard requested clarification of the status of his request on May
22 1, 2002, for an arborist's opinion with regard to weighting criteria.

23
24 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Barnard that although she has attempted to
25 contact the City Arborist with regard to this request, he has been extremely busy
26 with other responsibilities, adding that although she is still attempting to arrange a
27 meeting to discuss this issue, she assumes that health would be the top priority
28 with regard to the tree resources.

29
30 Commissioner Barnard discussed the issues involved in weighing the factors with
31 regard to expert testimony from staff and applicants, and testimony from the
32 public. He expressed his opinion that the Planning Commission is not
33 knowledgeable enough to make an informed decision with regard to weighting
34 characteristics of scenic trees.

35
36 Commissioner Pogue requested clarification of what would be a manageable
37 number of resources to address.

38
39 Observing that he is not an arborist, Chairman Voytilla emphasized that he would
40 like to be able to clearly define for the public why a certain tree is considered
41 scenic. He expressed his agreement with Commissioner Barnard's statement that
42 the Commissioners do not personally have the qualifications to rate the
43 significance of these tree resources.

44

1 Commissioner Barnard pointed out that many of the street trees that are
2 conditioned in private developments have been included as resources in the
3 Scenic Tree Inventory.
4

5 Principal Planner Hal Bergsma emphasized that these trees are being considered
6 as scenic resources as a certain category under Goal 5, observing that Goal 5 is
7 simply a process that does not prescribe any specific outcome. He explained that
8 Goal 5 provides that it is necessary for an entity to go through certain steps prior
9 to reaching a conclusion with regard to which resources should be protected and
10 how they should be protected. He expressed his opinion that it is not necessary
11 for an individual to be an expert in order to participate in a decision with regard to
12 which trees should be protected when addressing trees as scenic resources.
13 Observing that health is an issue and that an arborist could determine the health of
14 a tree, he pointed out that beauty is in the eye of the beholder and an arborist is
15 not necessary to determine which trees are the most beautiful.
16

17 Commissioner Barnard expressed his opinion that Mr. Bergsma had just clarified
18 that appearance is the most important category with regard to the significance of
19 scenic trees.
20

21 Mr. Bergsma advised Commissioner Barnard that Goal 5 addresses these
22 resources as they are at the present time rather than in the distant future, adding
23 that another inventory would most likely be done when these younger trees reach
24 maturity. He emphasized that he would not downgrade the Commission's ability
25 to make a call with regard to which trees are scenic resources, adding that it is
26 necessary to make this decision under this process. He pointed out that the City
27 Arborist could attend the next meeting to respond to any questions, reiterating that
28 it is not up to any expert to tell the Commissioners which trees are scenic.
29

30 Commissioner Bliss referred to the age issue, expressing his opinion that the full
31 potential of a resource must be considered, whether this has been achieved at this
32 point or not.
33

34 Chairman Voytilla explained that staff requires a specific recommendation from
35 the Commission, observing that Commissioner Barnard had suggested 25% of the
36 raw score.
37

38 Ms. Fryer clarified the definition of significance in the Goal 5 process, as follows:
39

- 40 1. Inventory of resources (location, quality and quantity).
- 41 2. Determine which resources are significant (all, none or somewhere in
42 between).
- 43 3. Only those resources that are significant go on to the next step, which
44 includes the environmental, social, economic and energy consequences of
45 fully protecting, partially protecting or not protecting the resource from
46 conflicting uses.

- 1 4. Create a program, which will include both regulatory and non-regulatory
2 components (education, information on the web, and/or regulations that
3 are very similar to or different from current regulations).
4

5 Observing that the majority of the tree resources would most likely receive partial
6 protection, Ms. Fryer noted that there would also be trees that would be fully
7 protected, as well as those that would receive no protection.
8

9 Chairman Voytilla pointed out that the agenda for May 22, 2002, includes both SV
10 2002-0001 – SW Metz Street and SW 124th Avenue Street Vacation, which was
11 continued this evening, and CUP 2002-0001 – Washington County Sheriff's,
12 Elections and Justice Court Building, as well as another Work Session with regard
13 to the Scenic Tree Project.
14

15 Commissioner Barnard observed that he would not be available for the meeting of
16 May 22, 2002.
17

18 Chairman Voytilla mentioned that Commissioner Young would still be out of
19 town and would not be available for the meeting of May 22, 2002.
20

21 Commissioner Johansen requested that the Planning Commissioners be provided
22 with a new official and staff roster, including their telephone numbers and e-mail
23 addresses.
24

25 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**
26

27 The meeting adjourned at 8:58 p.m.